

Exhibit 3

Brooke T. Mossman, M.S., Ph.D.

Page 1

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

- - -

IN RE: JOHNSON & :
JOHNSON TALCUM POWDER :
PRODUCTS MARKETING, :
SALES PRACTICES, AND : NO. 16-2738
PRODUCTS LIABILITY : (FLW) (LHG)
LITIGATION :
:
THIS DOCUMENT RELATES :
TO ALL CASES :

- - -

April 8, 2019

- - -

Videotaped deposition of
BROOKE T. MOSSMAN, M.S., Ph.D., taken
pursuant to notice, was held at Hotel
Vermont, 41 Cherry Street, Burlington,
Vermont, beginning at 9:12 a.m., on the
above date, before Michelle L. Gray, a
Registered Professional Reporter,
Certified Shorthand Reporter, Certified
Realtime Reporter, and Notary Public.

- - -

GOLKOW LITIGATION SERVICES
877.370.3377 ph | 917.591.5672 fax
deps@golkow.com

1 APPEARANCES:

2

3 THE SMITH LAW FIRM, PLLC
BY: R. ALLEN SMITH, JR., ESQ.

4 300 Concourse Boulevard
Suite 104

5 Ridgeland, Mississippi 39157
(601) 952-1422

6 Allen@smith-law.org

7 - and -

8 BEASLEY ALLEN, P.C.
BY: P. LEIGH O'DELL, ESQ.

9 218 Commerce Street
Montgomery, Alabama 36104

10 (334) 269-2343
leigh.odell@beasleyallen.com

11

- and -

12

ROBINSON CALCAGNIE, INC.
13 BY: CYNTHIA L. GARBER, ESQ.

14 19 Corporate Plaza Drive
Newport Beach, California 92660

(949) 720-1288

15 cgarber@robinsonfirm.com

Representing the Plaintiffs

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Brooke T. Mossman, M.S., Ph.D.

Page 3

1 APPEARANCES: (Cont'd.)

2

3 DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
4 BY: JACK N. FROST, JR., ESQ.
5 600 Campus Drive
6 Florham Park, New Jersey 07932
7 (973)549.7106
8 Jack.frost@dbbr.com

6

- and -

7

8 SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOM LLP
9 BY: GEOFFREY M. WYATT, ESQ.
10 1440 New York Avenue, NW
11 Washington, D.C. 20005
12 (202) 371-7008
13 geoffrey.wyatt@skadden.com
14 Representing the Defendants, Johnson
15 & Johnson entities

12

13 SEYFARTH SHAW, LLP
14 BY: RENÉE B. APPEL, ESQ.
15 975 F Street, NW
16 Washington, D.C. 20004
17 (202) 463-2400
18 rappel@seyfarth.com
19 Representing the Defendant, PCPC

16

17 TUCKER ELLIS, LLP
18 BY: JAMES W. MIZGALA, ESQ.
19 233 South Wacker Drive
20 Suite 6950
21 Chicago, Illinois 60606
22 (312) 624-6307
23 james.mizgala@tuckerellis.com
24 Representing the Defendant, PTI
Royston LLC and PTI Union LLC

22

ALSO PRESENT:

23

VIDEOTAPE TECHNICIAN:
Dan Lawlor

24

Brooke T. Mossman, M.S., Ph.D.

Page 355

1 Q. The concentrations that you
2 used, that being -- and I'm talking about
3 Shukla. I'm talking about 34 --
4 15 micrometers squared per centimeter
5 squared and 75 micrometers squared per
6 centimeter squared, would translate to
7 what micrograms per centimeter squared?

8 A. Okay. And that's -- if you
9 look at Figure 2 in Shukla, Page 4 of 10.

10 Q. Yep.

11 A. And the top panel, you'll
12 see the vertical and the horizontal. And
13 if we look at asbestos and talc, you can
14 see here that the upper column, going
15 from 015 and from talc 15, et cetera,
16 that is the comparative weight per -- so
17 it's weight per unit area of dish.

18 So that's your weight
19 concentration.

20 The numbers below are your
21 surface area concentrations.

22 Q. Okay. So let's get on the
23 same page.

24 A. Mm-hmm.

Brooke T. Mossman, M.S., Ph.D.

Page 356

1 Q. If I'm looking at asbestos
2 below at 15 micrometers squared per
3 centimeter squared, how many -- what
4 would that translate to to micrograms per
5 centimeter squared?

6 A. Micrograms, it would --
7 Okay. So that would equal one.

8 Q. 15 would be one, right?

9 A. With asbestos.

10 Q. Right. And 75 would be --

11 A. 75 would be five.

12 Q. Five, okay.

13 A. And 15 would be
14 approximately -- well, it's 16.2, would
15 be one with talc. And it would be, again
16 in the same range, 75 versus 81 talc.

17 So we're actually adding
18 talc at higher surface concentrations but
19 fractionally so, as compared to asbestos.

20 Q. My question is, would the 15
21 micrometers squared per centimeter
22 squared for talc that you used the
23 concentration of in this case, would that
24 equal one microgram per centimeter

1 squared?

2 A. Approximately, yes.

3 Q. Okay. That's what I
4 thought.

5 A. Yes. They're comparable.

6 Q. Okay. And 75 micrograms per
7 centimeter squared -- micrograms squared
8 per centimeter squared would equal five
9 micrograms per centimeter squared, right?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. Okay. Now I'm on the same
12 page. That's what I needed.

13 A. Okay.

14 Q. All right. And do you
15 believe that those concentrations are
16 appropriate to use in in vitro studies to
17 determine the pathogenicity of minerals
18 such as talc and asbestos?

19 A. Yes. And that's based upon
20 the toxicity data that is provided in A
21 and B. So they're comparable
22 concentrations. The asbestos as we can
23 see at five, was toxic and the talc was
24 not. So we -- and you can see that in

Brooke T. Mossman, M.S., Ph.D.

Page 358

1 the dose-response that we did with five
2 concentrations of talc ranging from one
3 to 20.

4 Q. Okay. So talc you tested at
5 one microgram per centimeter squared,
6 five micrograms per centimeter squared,
7 ten micrograms per centimeter squared,
8 and 20 microgram per centimeter squared?

9 A. 15 and 20.

10 Q. 10, 15, and 20?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Okay.

13 A. So the message is that you
14 don't want to work with something that's
15 going to kill all the cells, so you can't
16 go higher. And in fact, that's a reason
17 that with time, we didn't look at the
18 higher concentration of asbestos.

19 Q. I want to attach this as
20 Exhibit 27 so I won't forget this.
21 Because I could.

22 (Document marked for
23 identification as Exhibit
24 Mossman-37.)